

Amended Claims With Mark-ups to Show Changes Made

1. (Amended) A method for browsing a [multimedia data] moving picture comprising:

[(1)]receiving [multimedia] moving picture information and multiple supplementary information including content information and real information on a program in the [multimedia] moving picture information [of] on [each] at least one object in the [multimedia] moving picture information;

[(2)]separating the [multimedia] moving picture information and the multiple supplementary information;

[(3)]displaying the [multimedia] moving picture information; and,

[(4)]browsing/searching supplementary information related to a particular object from the multiple supplementary information, and displaying the supplementary information when a user requests for browsing/searching the supplementary information related to the particular object.

3. (Amended) A method as claimed in claim 19 [1], wherein the content information and the real information includes selective combinations of object information, event information, place information, and object/event/place in a graph.

8. (Amended) A multi-level object data structure in a system for displaying [multimedia] moving picture information,

wherein the object data comprises multiple supplementary information on each object included in the [multimedia] moving picture information, wherein the multiple supplementary information further includes content information and real information on a particular program.

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-33 are currently pending in the above-referenced patent application. Claims 1, 3, and 8 have been amended and claims 19-33 have been newly added by way of the present amendment.

In the Office Action: Claims 1 and 3-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Balogh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,677). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Balogh et al. Claims 3-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh et al. in view of Lagarde et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,918). Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh et al. in view of Lagarde et al. Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh et al. in view of Lagarde et al. Claims 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh et al. in view of Lagarde et al.

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections over claims 1 and 3-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which is regarded as the invention. In the Office Action on page 2, it is stated that there is not enough information in the specification to explain the terms “real information” and “content information”. The Applicants respectfully disagree. As an example, on page 6 of the specification, lines 3-6, it is disclosed that content information on a moving picture is information on a place or object

having a meaning in view of content of the moving picture. It is further disclosed that real information is information on a real place which is a meaningful place in view of the content of the moving picture. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the phrases “real information” and “content information” are not indefinite.

In response to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Balogh et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. This claim recites receiving moving picture information and multiple supplementary information. The multiple supplementary information includes content information and real information on a program in the moving picture information on at least one object in the moving picture information.

Balogh et al. relates to generation, archiving, and retrieval of digital images with evoked suggestion-set captions and natural language interface. However, unlike the recitations of claim 1, there is no disclosure in Balogh et al. of multiple supplementary information including content information and real information. At least for this reason, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established.

In response to the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Balogh et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. This claim recites multiple supplementary information including content information and real information. As discussed above, Balogh et al. does not disclose real information and content information. At least for this reason, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established.

In response to the rejection of claims 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh et al. in view of Lagarde et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. These claims comprise the same recitations, as discussed above, for claim 1. As discussed above, Balogh et al. does not disclose real information and content information. Lagarde et al. relates to a method for distribution task fulfillment of web browser requests. However, Lagarde et al. does not disclose supplementary information including real information and content information, as recited in claims 3-7. Accordingly, Lagarde et al. doesn't alleviate the deficiencies of Balogh et al. At least for these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

In response to the rejection of Claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh et al. in view of Lagarde et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. These claims comprise the same recitations, as discussed above, for claim 8. As discussed above, neither Balogh et al. nor Lagarde et al. disclose real information and content information. At least for this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

In response to the rejection of claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh et al. in view of Lagarde et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. These claims recite real information and content information. As discussed above, neither Balogh et al. nor Lagarde et al. disclose real information and content information. At least for this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

In response to the rejection of claims 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Balogh et al. in view of Lagarde et al., the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. These claims recite multiple object information having content information and real information. As discussed above, neither Balogh et al. nor Lagarde et al. disclose content information and real information. At least for this reason, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

The Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of newly added claim 19. Claim 19 is dependent upon claim 1, which has been discussed above. The Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is allowable at least based on the dependency on claim 1.

The Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of newly added claims 20-26. These claims recite a method comprising receiving supplemental information specific to each object of a plurality of objects included in moving picture data. The supplemental information includes real information and content information. The Applicants respectfully submit that these recitations are not disclosed in the applied prior art references.

The Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of newly added claims 27-33. These claims recite an apparatus configured to receive supplemental information specific to each object of the plurality of objects included in moving picture data. The supplemental information includes real information and content information. The Applicants respectfully submit that this recitation is not disclosed in the applied prior art references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned patent agent, **Daniel H. Sherr**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Daniel H. Sherr
Registration No. 46,425

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200
703 502-9440 DYK/DHS/czr
Date: January 28, 2003